

Serial No.: 09/521,685

Docket No: 112770 CON

REMARKS

Addressing several administrative matters relative to PTOL-326, it is believed that a) Entry 1 was intended to reference 08 July 2005, b) Entry 6 was intended to reference claims 47-53 and 57-60 and c) Entry 7 was intended to reference claims 45 and 46. The actions taken by applicant in this Amendment are based on those beliefs.

Claims 45 and 46 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Rather than taking that particular action, applicant has amended claim 44 to include the limitations of claim 45, now canceled. It is submitted that this is equivalent to having rewritten claim 45 in independent form, so that claim 44 is believed to be allowable. Claim 46 has been amended to depend from claim 44.

Claims 57-60 have now been canceled. Thus all other claims in the application depend either directly or indirectly from claim 44 and thus are believed to be allowable as well.

Claims 44-53 and 57-60 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Each claim still in the application in which the term "short-term certificate" appeared has now been amended to simply recite "certificate," thereby obviating any indefiniteness.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant does not intend the various claim amendments and/or cancellations effected by this Amendment to constitute agreement by applicant with the various grounds of rejection set forth in the Office action. Rather, per the standard policy of the assignee, it has been decided to obtain a patent with those claims that have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter while preserving the option of pursuing the rejected claims, or claims similar to them, in a continuation.

Reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Maher

By: 

Ronald D. Slusky, Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,585
(212) 246-4546

353 West 56th Street—Suite 5L
New York, N.Y. 10019-3775
Date: 11/29/2005